



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

KT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,956	08/17/2001	Jun Koyama	12732-071001	1626
26171	7590	04/19/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. 11TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500			SHENG, TOM V	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2673		12
DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,956	KOYAMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Tom V Sheng	2673		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 54-61 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 23-53 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 09/931061. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention that the use of both (volatile) and non-volatile memory circuits in a pixel are applicable to various kinds of matrix displays and further applicable to a variety of electronic devices that utilizes a display.

Claims 12-22 are provisionally rejected over claims 11-20 of the copending application for the above same reason.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 23-35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-32 of copending Application No. 09/931061. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because even though claims 23-35 of the current application are directed to liquid crystal display and claims 21-32 of the copending application are directed to electro-luminescent display, the corresponding pixel-memory structure and writing/reading method are exactly the same, and it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the pixel-memory structure and functionality are factually independent from the display type.

Claims 36-49 are provisionally rejected over claims 33-45 of the copending application for the above same reason.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4, 9-12, 15, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner (US Patent 6246386 B1) in view of Kobayashi (US Patent 4432610).

As for claims 1 and 12, Perner teaches a liquid crystal display device (figure 2) having a plurality of pixels (figure 7; matrix 174 of NxM pixels 176; column 11, lines 22-29), each of the plural of pixels comprising a plurality of (n x m) memory circuits (each pixel of the LCD has eighteen dual port DRAM cells; column 5, lines 47-59). For Perner, n is 18 and m is 1.

Perner does not teach a plurality of (n x k) non-volatile memory circuits in addition to a plurality of memory circuits. Kobayashi teaches that when nonvolatile memory transistor is used in the pixel of a LCD device, the data stored would not be erased even in the case of a momentary power failure. See figure 2, individual pixel memory cell 12, and column 4, line 60 - column 5, line 12.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a plurality of non-volatile memory circuits of Kobayashi with a plurality of memory circuits of Perner in a LCD device because of the benefit of maintaining a last picture being displayed before the device is either shutdown due to a momentary power failure or unplugged from a power source for moving to a different location. For example, n = 18 and k =1 if only one non-erasable frame is desired.

As for claims 4 and 15, Perner's memory circuits are DRAM cells.

As for claims 9 and 20, Kobayashi teaches the forming of non-volatile memory transistors on a monocrystalline silicon substrate.

As for claims 10-11 and 21-22, LCD devices are well known to be incorporated in an electronic device such as television set, personal computer, portable terminal, video camera, and head mounted display.

6. Claims 2, 5, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner and Kobayashi as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US Patent 5699078).

As for claims 2, 5, 13, and 16, Perner teaches the use of DRAM for the memory circuits. Perner does not teach using SRAM for the memory circuits and EEPROM for the non-volatile memory circuits.

Yamazaki teaches the incorporation of a memory in which information on the characteristics of the pixels are stored, into a liquid crystal device. See column 2, lines 23-30. Moreover, Yamazaki teaches that volatile memories such as DRAM and SRAM, as well as non-volatile memories such as EEPROM and flash memories are suitable choices. See column 4, lines 36-40.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate SRAM of Yamazaki as the memory circuits and EEPROM of Yamazaki as the non-volatile memory circuits because they are all suitable choices in implementing the memories. Certainly, factors such as design complexity, sizes, and etc. would come into play.

7. Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner and Kobayashi as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US Patent 5349366).

As for claims 3 and 14, Perner teaches the use of DRAM for the memory circuits. Perner does not teach using FeRAM for the memory circuits.

Yamazaki teaches the incorporation of material such as ferroelectrics to function as memory.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the memory taught by Yamazaki can be applied for the memory circuits of Perner, because it would allow rewriting only specified pixels as taught by Yamazaki and would also simply constitute an alternative choice of memory component in the pixel. See Abstract and column 9, lines 40-55.

8. Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner and Kobayashi as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Parks (US Patent 5471225).

As for claims 6 and 17, Perner teaches a LCD device incorporating an array of memory circuits with each pixel. However, Perner does not teach that the memory circuits are formed on a glass substrate.

Parks teaches a LCD having a plurality of storage cells. Further, provided across a glass material are the storage cells comprising bit lines, word lines, display electrodes, pass-gate transistors, and latching circuits for storing video data.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that glass substrate of Parks is a good insulator for laying the memory and driving circuits of an LCD display. Also, the transparent property of glass lends naturally to use with liquid crystal display, and thus accounts for the common usage.

9. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner and Kobayashi as modified by Parks as applied to claims 1/12 and 6/17 above, and further in view of Fonash et al. (US Patent 5945866).

As of claims 7 and 18, Perner as modified teaches a LCD device having an array of memory circuits per pixel; wherein the memory circuits are formed on a glass substrate.

Perner as modified does not teach that a plastic substrate can be used also.

Fonash teaches that TFTs can be deposited on either glass or plastic substrate (figure 1). TFTs are transistor circuits used for driving as well as memory circuits of Perner as modified. See column 1, lines 44-52.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that either substrate, glass or plastic of Fonash, can be used for manufacturing the circuits, which is readily recognized as an alternative material choice.

10. Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perner and Kobayashi as modified by Parks as applied to claims 1/12 and 6/17 above, and further in view of Johnson (US Patent 4752118).

As of claims 8 and 19, Perner as modified teaches a LCD device having an array of memory circuits per pixel; wherein the memory circuits are formed on a glass substrate.

Perner as modified does not teach that a stainless steel substrate can be used also.

Johnson teaches that amorphous integrated circuits can be deposited on either glass or stainless steel (column 1, line 22 - column 2, line 2). In the case of stainless steel, it should first be coated with a layer of insulating layer (column 8, line 61 - column 9, line 2).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that either substrate, glass or stainless steel of Johnson, can be used for manufacturing the circuits, which is readily recognized as an alternative material choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 23-53 are allowed.
12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior arts of record teaches the recitations

"wherein each gate electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to one of the n writing gate signal lines, with no two gate electrodes sharing the same writing gate signal line, wherein each input electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to the source signal line, wherein each output electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to one of m circuits out of the $n \times m$ memory circuits through one of n units out of the $2n$ memory circuit selecting units, each memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one output electrode, wherein each output electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to one of k circuits out of the $n \times k$ non-volatile memory circuits through one of n units out of the $2n$ non-volatile memory circuit selecting units, each non-volatile memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one output electrode, wherein each gate electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically connected to one of the n reading gate signal lines, with no two gate electrodes sharing the same reading gate signal line, wherein each input electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically connected to one of m circuits out of the $n \times m$ memory circuits through one of n units out of the $2n$ memory circuit selecting units, each memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one input electrode, wherein each input electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically connected to one of k circuits out of the $n \times k$ non-volatile memory circuits through one of n units of the $2n$ non-volatile memory circuit selecting units, each non-volatile memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one input electrode, and wherein each output electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically connected to one of electrodes of the liquid crystal element" and remainder

as cited in claim 23, and

"wherein each gate electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to the writing gate signal line, wherein each input electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to one of the n source signal lines, with no two input electrodes sharing the same source signal line, wherein each output electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to one of m circuits out of the $n \times m$ memory circuits through one of n units out of the $2n$ memory circuit selecting units, each memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one output electrode, wherein each output electrode of the n writing transistors is electrically connected to one of k circuits out of the $n \times k$ non-volatile memory circuits through one of n units out of the $2n$ non-volatile memory circuit selecting units, each non-volatile memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one output electrode, wherein each gate electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically connected to one of the n reading gate signal lines, with no two gate electrodes sharing the same reading gate signal line, wherein each input electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically connected to one of m circuits out of the $n \times m$ memory circuits through one of n units out of the $2n$ memory circuit selecting units, each memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one input electrode, wherein each input electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically connected to one of k circuits out of the $n \times k$ non-volatile memory circuits through one of n units out of the $2n$ non-volatile memory circuit selecting units, each non-volatile memory circuit selecting unit making selection for no more than one input electrode, and wherein each output electrode of the n reading transistors is electrically

connected to one of electrodes of the liquid crystal element" and remainder as cited in claim 36, and

"wherein the following (a) through (e) are available and one of the following (a) through (e) is selected and conducted in pixels in the row of the selected gate signal line out of the plural pixels:

(a) the n bit digital video signals inputted from the source signal line are written in memory circuits;

(b) the n bit digital video signals stored in the memory circuits are read;

(c) the n bit digital video signals inputted from the source signal line or the n bit digital video signals stored in the memory circuits are written in non-volatile memory circuits;

(d) the n bit digital video signals stored in the non-volatile memory circuits are read; and

(e) the n bit digital video signals stored in the non-volatile memory circuits are written in the memory circuits" and remainder as cited in claim 50.

Claims 24-35, 37-49, and 51-53 are dependent on claim 23, 36, and 50, respectively.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's request that the provisional double-patenting rejections be held in abeyance and re-evaluated upon allowance and issue of the '061 application is

acknowledged; however, it is the office policy to continue the rejections until terminal disclaimer is filed.

14. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/11/2004 with respect to claims 1 and 12 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the memory circuits (volatile) and non-volatile memory circuits is in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The clear benefits are being able to dynamically store a number of frames using space saving memory circuits and to maintain a last picture being displayed when power is turned off.

16. In response to applicant's argument that the present rejection does not address any issue that would arise in creating a "plurality of pixels comprising a plurality memory circuits and a plurality of non-volatile memory circuits", the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined

teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom V Sheng whose telephone number is (703) 305-6708. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tom Sheng
April 8, 2004



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600